REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34-37 are pending in the application. In the non- final Office Action of January 12, 2007, the Examiner made the following disposition:

A.)   Rejected claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Housel III (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,869)("Housel")* in view of *Megiddo, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,957,224)("Megiddo")*.

B.)   Rejected claims 15-20, 22-25, 27, 28, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below. Claims 1-3, 6, 15-20, 22-25, 27-29, and 35 have been amended. Claims 14, 28, 36, and 37 have been canceled.

A.)   <u>Rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-20, 22-25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Housel* in view of *Megiddo*:</u>

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

<u>Regarding claims 1-8, 14-22, 28, 35, and 37:</u>

Independent claims 1, 15, and 35, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to receiving a first uniform resource locator ("URL") of a first length. The first URL corresponds to data identified by a data transmission request expression (*e.g.*, a URL) of a second type. The first URL is replaced with a replacement URL having a second length. The data is retrieved using the replacement URL.

Further, it is determined whether <u>the retrieved data</u> comprises an embedded data transmission request expression of the second type. When the retrieved data comprises a data transmission request expression of the second type, the data transmission request expression in the retrieved data is replaced with a replacement data transmission request expression.

Thus, the URL is replaced with a replacement URL, and an embedded data transmission request expression <u>in the retrieved data</u> may be replaced with a replacement expression.

This is clearly unlike *Housel* in view of *Megiddo*, which fails to disclose or suggest replacing a URL prior to retrieving data and then replacing an embedded data transmission request expression <u>in the retrieved data</u>. In fact, nowhere does *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* disclose or suggest replacing an embedded data transmission request expression in the retrieved

11

data. The Examiner argues that *Housel* 8:56-67 somehow teaches replacing an embedded expression in a retrieved data, however, *Housel* makes no such teaches. *Office Action of 1/12/07*, page 4. *Housel* 8:56-67 merely describes that either a URL or a hash key may be used <u>to index data</u>. Nowhere does *Housel* suggest examining retrieved data to locate embedded data, let alone replacing an embedded data transmission request expression in the retrieved data. *Housel's* teachings are unrelated to replacing information that is within retrieved data.

Megiddo also fails to disclose or suggest replacing a URL prior to retrieving data and then replacing an embedded data transmission request expression in the retrieved data. Therefore, *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 15, and 35.

Claims 2-6, 8, 16-20, and 22 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 15 are allowable.

Claims 14, 28, and 37 have been canceled.

<u>Regarding claims 29 and 31:</u>

Independent claim 29, as amended, claims determined whether <u>retrieved data</u> comprises an embedded data transmission request expression of the second type. When the retrieved data comprises a data transmission request expression of the second type, the data transmission request expression in the retrieved data is replaced with a replacement data transmission request expression.

As discussed above, this is clearly unlike *Housel* in view of *Megiddo*, which fails to disclose or suggest determining whether <u>retrieved data</u> comprises an embedded data transmission request expression of the second type; and when the retrieved data comprises a data transmission request expression of the second type, replacing the data transmission request expression in the retrieved data with a replacement data transmission request expression.

Therefore, *Housel* in view of *Megiddo* still fails to disclose or suggest claim 29.

Claim 31 depends directly or indirectly from claim 29 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 29 is allowable.

<u>Regarding claims 9-13, 23-27, 32-34, and 36:</u>

Claims 9, 23, and 36 each claim subject matter relating to determining whether <u>retrieved data</u> comprises an embedded data transmission request expression of the second type. When the retrieved data comprises a data transmission request expression of the second type, the data transmission request expression in the retrieved data is replaced with a replacement data

transmission request expression.

As discussed above, this is clearly unlike *Housel* in view of *Megiddo*, which fails to disclose or suggest determining whether <u>retrieved data</u> comprises an embedded data transmission request expression of the second type; and when the retrieved data comprises a data transmission request expression of the second type, replacing the data transmission request expression in the retrieved data with a replacement data transmission request expression.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 24, 25, 27, and 34 depend directly or indirectly from claims 9, 23, or 32 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 9, 23, and 32 are allowable.

Claim 36 has been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

B.)   <u>Rejection of claims 15-20, 22-25, 27, 28, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §101:</u>

Independent claims 15 and 23 have been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the rejection.

Claims 16-20, 22, 24, 25, and 27 depend directly or indirectly from claims 15 or 23 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 15 and 23 are allowable.

Claims 28 and 37 have been canceled.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, 15-20, 22-25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, and 35. are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  /Christopher P. Rauch/   (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #58328
Attorneys for Applicant(s)